

## REMARKS

Claims 1-23 are pending in the present patent application. The Examiner has rejected claims 1-23. Applicant has amended claims 1, 7, 12, 17 and 23. Applicant respectfully requests re-examination and reconsideration of pending claims 1-23.

1. Examiner's Objection to the Drawings

The Examiner states that Figures 2 and 3 should be designated with a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. Applicant is submitting a separate Proposed Amendment to the Drawings directed to the Official Draftsman. Applicant submits that the proposed amendment to the drawings (as shown in red ink) obviates the Examiner's objection.

2. Examiner's Rejection of Claims 1-23 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Borman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,890,172). The Examiner states:

As per claim 1, Borman et al., hereinafter Borman, teach the following subject matter:

a browsing mechanism, with browser interface 400, at Figs. 5A-5C, and col. 7, lines 52-53, configured to render a current data resource, i.e., a file retrieved by the browser, and to navigate through plural data resources, using the Back 412, Forward, and Home 414 buttons; and

an attachment mechanism, using jumper window 300, at Fig. 3, configured to retrieve an attachment from the browser in response to a user event, i.e., by selecting a hot-link with a mouse, at col. 6, lines 55-60, the attachment associated with the current data resource, since the "hot-links are extracted from a file initially retrieved by the browser".

Borman teaches that the attachment comprises a resource locator [claim 2] at col. 7, lines 62-63, or source data [claim 3] associated with the current data resource at col. 13, lines 32-38. In addition, Borman inherently teaches selecting an attachment type [claim 4] at col. 13, lines 32-38, which describes different file types.

Furthermore, Borman teaches that the attachment mechanism comprises a button [claim 5] with refresh/update button 326, at Fig. 3, and col. 7, lines 17-19. As to claim 6, Borman teaches navigating to a first data resource, in browser window 406, using a resource locator, with hot-link 580, in a second data resource, in jumper window 300, all at Fig. 6.

Regarding claims 7-11, they are similar to claims 1, 4, 2, 3, and 6. Claims 12-16 correspond respectively to claims 7-11; while claims 17-19, 21, and 23 correspond to claims 1-3, 6, and 1.

As per claim 20, the first part is similar to claim 4, while the second part is taught by Borman with site window 404, at col. 7, line 32, and at Fig. 5A, which allows a user to select the property value by entering the site location.

As to claim 22, Borman teaches the following:

a stack configured to contain resource locators of navigated data resources, with history creation process 712, at Fig. 7, and col. 9, lines 40-42; and

one or more methods configured to browse navigated data by stepping forward or backward within the stack, at col. 9, lines 43-56.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. Borman does not anticipate all elements of the claimed invention. For example, Borman does not anticipate the selection of attachments for e-mail messages. As amended, independent claims 1, 7, 12, 17 and 23 refer to retrieving an attachment from a browser mechanism and *attaching the attachment to an e-mail message*. Borman is directed solely at the improved navigation of site references in a browser. All site references in Borman are extracted and displayed in a jumper to facilitate

further navigation. There is no teaching or suggestion in Borman of retrieving attachments for messaging purposes.

For at least the foregoing reason, Applicant submits that independent claims 1, 7, 12, 17 and 23 are allowable over the cited art. Further, dependent claims 2-6, 8-11, 13-16 and 18-22, being dependent upon allowable base claims, are also allowable for at least the foregoing reason.

Further, with respect to the Examiner's assertion that Borman inherently teaches selecting an attachment type (with respect to claims 4, 8, 13 and 20), Applicant submits that all site references extracted from the browser in Borman are URLs, and that no form of type selection is performed nor any need for type selection expressed. Further, the Examiner's reference to col. 13, lines 32-38 in Borman, is directed at a definition of a file. Applicant submits that the simple word definition of a file fails to teach or suggest, let alone anticipate, selection of an attachment type as claimed. Applicant submits that Borman performs no selection of attachment types, and that type selection is thus not inherent therein.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant contends that the cited reference does not anticipate, teach, disclose, or suggest the present invention. Thus, Applicant contends that claims 1-23 are in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

HECKER & HARRIMAN

Date: 11/3/99

By: [Signature]  
J.D. HARRIMAN II  
Reg. No. 31,967

HECKER & HARRIMAN  
1925 Century Park East  
Suite 2300  
Los Angeles, California 90067  
(310) 286-0377

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231, on November 3, 1999.

[Signature] 11-3-99  
Signature Date  
Lillian E. Rodriguez